DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 510 HE 001 261

AUTHOR Patterson, Frederick D.
TITLE [Development Programs at Negro Institutions.]
INSTITUTION National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 11 Nov 69
NOTE 15p.; Speech given before the Council of Presidents of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Chicago, Illinois, November 11, 1969

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.85
DESCRIPTORS *Budgeting, Educational Facilities, Educational Quality, *Equalization Aid, Finance Occupations, *Financial Support, *Higher Education, Money Management, *Negro Colleges

ABSTRACT

The United Negro College Fund (UNCF) was organized primarily to help provide approximately 10% of the operating budgets of its members, the private Negro colleges. Today, despite the growing income of the UNCF, many of its member colleges are seriously in need of capital funds. In an evaluation of higher education for Negroes that was sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation and published in 1965, Earl McGrath points out that although the majority of Negro institutions are academically weak, they have counterparts in the all-white colleges. This led him to the conclusion that the quality of education in the Negro Colleges is not a matter of race but of resources. Accepting McGrath's challenge to multiply the financial resources that were available to Negro colleges, the Phelps-Stokes Fund obtained a grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and undertook a three-year project in an aspect of fund raising not yet covered by the UNCF: raising capital funds to meet endowment, building, and special project needs. Development offices were established on the campuses of 23 selected public and private Negro colleges. The program's success justified its expansion to additional institutions and a second grant. With federal support, a consortia of development programs for 40 colleges was subsequently formed. Recognition of the development function by Negro colleges is growing, but there is a need for more effective trustee involvement, better use of presidents' time, and more support of development offices by administrative teams. (WM)

ED034510

[" Development Programs at Negro Institutions "]

Council of Presidents of the National Association
of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
The Luncheon Session, Chicago Room, LaSalle Hotel
Chicago, Illinois, 12:30 p.m., November 11, 1969
--F. D. Patterson, President
Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York City

Private colleges for Negro youth came into existence shortly after the middle of the Nineteenth Century. Two of them -- Wilberforce University in Ohio and Lincoln University in Pennsylvania -- were organized in 1854. Lincoln University first existed as Ashmun Institute, and there is a running argument between Wilberforce and Lincoln as to which is the older. Most of the private colleges, however, came into existence after 1863 when the Emancipation Proclamation was issued and date from 1867 when Fisk, Howard, Hampton, and others were started. Shortly after the first private colleges were started, the Southern states created land-grant institutions as segregated branches of the A & M colleges in the seventeen Southern states. Most of the private colleges had an open-enrollment policy dating from the very beginning, and some of them placed in their charters the fact that race

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE001261

not
would/be a condition for admission. For a period of at least 60 to 75 years, the private Negro colleges had the ascendancy over the public Negro colleges. Because at least a few of these private colleges were able to develop substantial support, they boasted faculties of superior attainment and limited facilities of good quality. This number included Fisk University, Hampton Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Atlanta University, Spelman College, and perhaps one or two others. Most colleges were church-related and existed largely on the varying degrees of support coming from their respective denominations. The total support available to any and all of these institutions was completely inadequate to meet the always pressing demands of eager young people anxious for an education. Since most of these youth came poorly equipped from secondary schools, they required remedial instruction. Therefore, the cost of remedial work added financial and administrative burdens upon these inadequately supported institutions.

Most of the private institutions sought their support from the

"North," which included primarily New England states. They developed and maintained this support by putting quartets and choral groups in the field on tours of wealthy resorts during the summer months. The unusual ability of a few of the administrative heads of these institutions, such as Armstrong of Hampton, Booker Washington and Robert R. Moton of Tuskegee, and the white presidents of Atlanta and Fisk Universities, enabled them to attract comparatively large resources.

These colleges "thrived" during the period when large fortunes were not unusual and taxes were comparatively low. Carnegie and Rockefeller were among the noted names whose benefactions included the private Negro colleges, although the Carnegie interest was related primarily to library development. George Eastman gave probably the largest single gift to Hampton and Tuskegee drives (consisting of $2 million each) in the 1926-27 campaign. Unfortunately this great example was not copied by other philanthropists in anything like this amount, although Arthur Curtis James, Andrew Mellon, and a great many others gave sums from

$10,000 to $100,000 and even several hundred thousand dollars on occasion.

In the late 20's, as taxation began to increase -- and particularly in the 30's with the Roosevelt Administration -- a substantial decrease took place in the funds available to the private colleges for Negro youth. Some of the rich contributors were angry because of New Deal policies; others had lost their money in the 1929 crash; and a great many others had died and their children, if they inherited their money, all too frequently did not inherit their interest in these institutions. (Although statistics on personal incomes indicate an increase in the number of millionaires, persons of newly acquired wealth have not expressed, as a group, the same interest in these colleges that was manifested in earlier years.) The result was an increasingly critical situation, with the cost of fund raising mounting, along with a similar increase in the cost of education, while the Negro colleges faced the situation of a totally inadequate machinery to help them meet their financial needs.

The steadily worsening effort in fund raising by the individual private colleges had reached a low point of diminishing returns by 1940. An effort to deal with this situation resulted in the creation of the United Negro College Fund as an agency which would appeal primarily for current operating funds in behalf of its membership. The basic approach of UNCF was to tell a story and do a better job of fund raising through the use of professional help and volunteers that could be enlisted across the country. The basic appeal was that of the needs of the youth to be served in the South, rather than emphasis upon the special claims of the individual member institutions. It early became apparent after the first campaign in 1944 that this joint approach was highly successful as compared with the individual efforts of the member colleges and, of course, was without direct cost to the participating institutions. The Fund continued to grow, and the income of nearly $7 million in 1969 compares most favorably with the modest sum of $760,000 that was raised in the first year of the joint effort.

The United Negro College Fund was organized primarily to help provide funds required for current operating budgets, and this need has been roughly described as 10 percent of these budgets. This served the major purpose of making available monies that could not be derived from tuition, because of the inability of most Negro students to pay more than an extremely modest sum. However, it was never intended that all of the capital needs would be met through the United Negro College Fund. Therefore, member colleges have been free -- except for the period set aside for the annual UNCF appeal -- to seek from interested friends, foundations, and the Federal Government those monies required for capital needs and special programs.

It has been clear in the past few years, however, that despite the growing income of the United Negro College Fund, this money is not enough. And to encourage larger current funds, the Fund has undertaken a reorganization of its program through a study financed by the Carnegie Corporation and supported by suggestions from the UNCF Board of

Directors. The second capital campaign, for $50 million, inaugurated at the White House by the late President Kennedy achieved substantial success in its first phase by raising $33 million; and the stronger UNCF colleges are well on their way to achieving the second phase of $20 million through individual efforts. Despite this, however, most of the colleges are still seriously in need of additional capital funds for buildings and endowment. So far as keeping abreast of advancing standards and the progress of most private institutions over the country, the gap seems to be widening.

It should be noted also that state-supported colleges for Negroes have come up substantially in their financing from State sources, partly because of the efforts of the South to meet the separate-but-equal qualification of the law and also because of the more enlightened recognition of the obligation to provide larger and better educational opportunities for Negro youth at public expense. It is probably safe to say that these institutions have done very little in the way of raising

monies from private sources. They have, to a limited extent, taken advantage of federal programs, which would be expected, because of their public nature. They may have gotten even more money from the Federal Government than have the private colleges. Both classes of institutions -- whether public or private -- have relied pretty much on the energies and leadership of their presidents. These presidents have been largely unassisted in their quest for needed resources to strengthen their institutions. Some presidents have done extremely well; others have been completely inept at public relations and fund raising, with the result that many of these colleges have stood still or lagged seriously in meeting the educational needs of their students.

The Supreme Court's decision in 1964 requiring desegregation of the public schools was regarded as a benchmark in the achievement of educational equality. It was hailed, as it should have been, as a step forward of great magnitude. Most persons who evaluated the impact of the decision were more hopeful of achieving immediate results than has

proven to be true. Many of such persons, recognizing how inadequate were most of the Negro institutions, called for their immediate abolition, with the thought that Negro students would simply attend formerly all-white institutions, and this would be the end of the problem. This proposed solution did not take into account either the resistance which the South would put up or the general unreadiness of most Southern Negro students who, because of their previous and continuing disadvantage at lower levels of education, were unprepared educationally, financially, or psychologically to enroll in significant numbers in the formerly forbidden white institutions. Despite this, however, there has continued a critical evaluation of the performance of the predominantly Negro institutions. They have been expected to compare favorably with non-Negro institutions whose sources of support have been substantially larger. In other words, they have been expected to give standard performance on sub-standard support. This, of course, is both unrealistic and impossible.

The Carnegie Foundation performed a great service a number of years ago when it conducted the Myrdal study which, in fact, placed the whole matter of Negro-white relations on an objective, scientific, and sociological basis, and predicted the inevitability of changes that have come about and those still to be realized. A similar evaluation of higher education for Negroes was underwritten by the Carnegie Corporation in a study conducted by Dr. Earl McGrath, former U. S. Commissioner of Education and then Executive Officer of the Institute of Higher Education, Columbia University. Dr. McGrath's report, "The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition," was published in 1965. Starting his study more or less with the usual biases toward the Negro colleges, he expected his findings would strongly suggest the elimination of the vast majority of these schools. Two years of intensive study revealed the inadequacy of resources available to Negro youth outside of the predominantly Negro colleges and the positive value of these colleges, despite a too frequently observed academic weakness.

The indispensable services rendered by these colleges, despite their great variation in quality, led Dr. McGrath to the conclusion that most if not all of the 123 predominantly Negro colleges, regardless of present quality, should be retained until other educational resources are available to the youth which these colleges are now serving. More than this, he found that though there is academic weakness in the majority of the predominantly Negro institutions, they all, regardless of strength, have their counterparts in the all-white colleges. This applies to the least satisfactory colleges, as well as to those of high quality. This led to the conclusion that quality of education in the Negro colleges was not a matter of race but of resources.

The Phelps-Stokes Fund gave careful consideration of these associated influences and the necessity of meeting the McGrath challenge to multiply many times the amounts of money available to the predominantly Negro colleges. With support from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Phelps-Stokes Fund decided to undertake a project that would not supplant

the United Negro College Fund but give emphasis to that aspect of fund raising which the UNCF did not cover, namely, the individual effort to secure monies for capital purposes to meet endowment, building, and special project needs.

Recognizing that the public colleges are growing in size and are educating and will continue to educate a large number of Negro youth over the next decade and more, and that both public and private colleges are moving toward integration, it was decided that the project which would stress the organization of development offices on the campuses of predominantly Negro colleges should include public as well as private colleges. This plan envisioned the creation of development offices to seek monies from all available sources in amounts substantially in excess of those obtained in previous efforts. Development offices would encourage an increase in alumni giving and provide a resource to the presidents of the predominantly Negro colleges which would make their efforts more effective. Because development offices would perform

the research and spade work of fund raising, the presidents would hopefully have time to give greater leadership to the academic and extra-curricular programs within their respective institutions. It was assumed that, unless there was a comprehensive effort to have the majority of predominantly Negro colleges establish competent development offices, the inadequate approach to resource development would continue, to the great detriment of the thousands of Negro young people who now and will continue to attend these institutions. Also recognized was that the hope to have these institutions remain as permanent components of American higher education, with their offerings available to all, made the achievement of larger resources in behalf of higher/quality education absolutely necessary.

Before the first program was initiated, a selected group of public and private institutions was informed that a request had been presented to the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation; and that if a grant were received, two groups of ten colleges each would be selected. These colleges were

asked to indicate their willingness to participate in a three-year program, with the payment of an annual fee of $2, 500. It was explained that these monies would be matched by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. Some 30 colleges indicated their willingness to participate; and out of this number, 23 were selected.

It is understandable that the full purpose of the program, as in any new program, was not completely understood and some difficulty was experienced in getting college presidents to designate either part-time or full-time development officers. Since all of the presidents had single-handedly carried the responsibility for financing their institutions through public and private sources, there was little immediate appreciation of the value of an assistant charged primarily with development. Despite this, however, the program has moved forward at an acceptable pace; and most of the participating colleges have named development officers. The development officers appointed were often young men with little if any experience in a development program.

The success of the first three-year Sloan program was sufficiently encouraging to warrant a second grant for two years, with an increased number of colleges. This was followed by a consortia of development programs for 40 colleges under Title III. These programs consist of institutes held at The Moton Center in Virginia; campus visits by professional staff; and cluster meetings on a regional basis to involve presidents, trustees, and key administrative officers. There will also be internships for junior staff members in well-organized development offices that have made outstanding records.

There is indication of a growing recognition of the development function on the predominantly Negro college campuses, supported by encouraging financial reports from alumni and community campaigns, as well as from foundation and industry solicitations.

Yet to be accomplished is greater and more effective involvement of trustees, better use of the president's time, and the perfection of an administrative team fully supportive of the office of development.